DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 629 UD 017 131

AUTHOR Giddings, Morsley G.
TITLE High School Preparation Program 1975-1976.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 25p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 20-63440

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *After School Tutoring; *Career Awareness; Dramatics; Instructional Trips; *Junior High Schools; *Program Evaluation; *Remedial Mathematics; *Remedial Reading
IDENTIFIERS New York (New York); Umbrella Projects

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates the High School Preparation Program which was designed to identify, orient and prepare third year intermediate and junior high school students for successful admission to the special high schools in New York City. 200 students participated in the program. Priority was given to those students who were one year or more below grade level in reading or mathematics. The program activities were: after school instruction in reading, mathematics, career education, drama and dance. Students also visited museums, colleges, high schools, office buildings, industrial plants, trade schools, factories, and government agencies. It was concluded that the students in the program achieved 65 percent mastery of a 400 word vocabulary list and demonstrated a month's gain in mathematics grade level for each month in the program. Students showed some improvement on the drama and dance test indicating greater appreciation. Reading improvement was not attained. A copy of the coordinator's report form and the teacher interview form is included in the appendix. (JP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED142629

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 20-63440

HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATION PROGRAM

1975 - 1976

Prepared by

Dr. Morsley G. Giddings

An Evaluation of Selected New York City Umbrella Programs funded under a Special Grant of the New York State Legislature performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975-1976 school year

UD017131

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DR. ANTHONY J. POLEMENI, DIRECTOR

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

Table of Contents

Chapter		Page
I.	The Program	1
	Trip Program	1
	The Staff	2
II.	Evaluative Procedures	4
III.	Findings	9
	Evaluation Objective 1	9
	Evaluation Objective 2	9
	Evaluation Objective 3	9
	Evaluation Objective 4	10
	Evaluation Objective 5	10
IV.	Summary of Major Findings Conclusions And Recommendations	14
Appendix		
	A	18
	B	21

Chapter I. The Program

The High School Preparation Program was designed to identify, orient and prepare third year intermediate and junior high school pupils for successful admission to the special high schools of New York City Public Schools through extended day co-curriculum programs. The overall objective of the program was to increase the number of pupils from District 13 eligible to attend special high schools in New York City.

The program was implemented from March 11, 1976 through June 8, 1976 at four sites in District 13, I.S. 117K, 300 Willoughby Avenue, I.S. 258K, 141 Macon Street, J.H.S. 265K, 101 Park Avenue, and J.H.S. 294K, 300 Adelphi Street. There were approximately four hundred pupils all scheduled for graduation from their respective intermediate and junior high schools selected for the program. Priority was given to those pupils who were one year or more below grade level in reading or mathematics. The program was conducted two afternoons per week Tuesdays and Thursdays from 3:00 P.M. to 5:00 P.M. at the selected sites. The activities at each site included:

1. Reading
2. Mathematics
3. Career Education
4. Drama and Dance

Trip Program

The major purpose of the trip program was to provide opportunities and resources to train students to make appropriate

choices. A trip program, consisting of seven full day trips was designed to achieve the following:

a. to increase student awareness of educational resources
b. to promote the constructive use of leisure time
c. to provide students with information that may be used in decisions about educational and career choices. Sites visited included museums, colleges, high schools, office buildings, industrial plants, trade schools, factories and government agencies.

The Project Director, the Guidance Counselor and four teachers accompanied the classes on each trip.

The Staff

Personnel for the High School Preparation Program, March 3, 1976 through June 8, 1976, number, 16 individuals, including the Project Director. All personnel worked four hours per week. The Project Director (an Assistant Principal) was responsible for supervising program staff; supervising, recruiting and selecting participants; implementing the proposed programmatic activities and supervising the maintenance of attendance and progress records and project documents. There were 12 teachers in the program. All are certified New York City Board of Education teaching personnel. They were responsible for the instruction and tutoring in Mathematics, Language Arts, Reading and Career Education. They organized and conducted the field trips to the selected sites and maintained all pertinent records for pupil attendance and progress.

There were a Drama Instructor (Consultant) and a Dance Instructor (Consultant). They were responsible for the activites, attendance records and the monitoring of pupil progress in the Drama and Dance components. A Guidance Counselor was also part of the full time staff of the project.

Chapter II. Evaluation Procedures

The project evaluator made several on-site visits and held interviews with the Project Coordinator, the Project Director and several of the teachers. To determine the effectiveness with which the evaluation objectives were attained with the participants the evaluator observed the program in operation at each center on at least two different occasions.

The objectives of the evaluation are:

Evaluation Objective 1: To determine whether as a result of participation in the reading component of the program, pupil participants attending 60% or more of the scheduled sessions will achieve a 65% mastery of a 400 word vocabulary list.

Evaluation Objective 2: To determine whether as a result of participation in the reading component of the program, pupil participants attending 60% or more of the scheduled sessions will demonstrate a month's gain in reading comprehension for each month in the program as measured by the pre-post administration of the Metropolitan Ahievement Test (MAT) Advanced, Forms G and H.

Evaluation Objective 3: To determine whether as a result of participation in the program pupil participants attending 60% or more of the scheduled sessions in the mathematics component of the program will demonstrate a month's gain in mathematics for each month in the program after the first two months as measured by the pre-post administration of intermediate form H of the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) in Mathematics.

Evaluation Objective 4: To determine whether as a result of participation in the program, pupil participants in 60% or

more of the scheduled sessions of the drama and dance components of the program will improve significantly on a staff designed drama and dance evaluative instrument.

Evaluation Objective 5: To determine the extent to which the program as actually carried out was consistent with the program as described in the project proposal and any subsequent modifications.

The project evaluator made several on-site visits and held interviews with the Project Coordinator, the Project Director and several of the teachers. To determine the effectiveness with which the evaluation objectives were attained with the participants, the evaluator observed the program in operation at each center on at least two different occasions.

The objectives of the evaluation are:

Evaluation Objective 1: To determine whether as a result of participation in the reading component of the program pupil participants attending 60% or more of the scheduled sessions will achieve a 65% mastery of a 400 word vocabulary list.

Subjects:

All program participants.

Methods and Procedures:

Participants will be administered the 400 word vocabulary test developed by the project staff.

Analysis of Data:

A count will be made to determine if participants attending 60% or more of the scheduled sessions demonstrate a 65% mastery of the 400 word vocabulary test (260) words).

Evaluation Object 2: To determine whether as a result of participation in the reading component of the program, pupil participants attending 60% or more of the scheduled sessions will demonstrate a month's gain in reading comprehension for each month in the program as measured by the pre-post administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) advanced, Forms G and H.

Subjects:

All project participants.

Methods and Procedures:

Participants will be given a pre-post administration of the MAT advanced Forms G and H.

Analysis of Data:

The pre-post test scores of the participants will be compared. Differences in mean performance will be computed. Participants demonstrating a month's gain in reading comprehension will be identified and tallied.

Evaluation Objective 3: To determine whether as a result of participation in the program participants attending 60% or more of the scheduled sessions of the mathematics component of the program will demonstrate a month's gain in mathematics for each month in the program after the first two months as measured by the pre-post administration of Intermediate Form H of the MAT in Mathematics.

Subjects:

All program participants.

Methods and Procedures:

Participants will be given a pre-post administration of the

MAT in Mathematics Intermediate Form H.

Analysis of Data:

The pre-post test scores of the participants will be compared. Differences in mean performance will be determined. Participants demonstrating one month's gain in mathematics will be identified and tallied.

Evaluation Objective 4: To determine whether as a result of participation in the program, pupil participants in 60% or more of the scheduled sessions of the drama and dance components of the program, will improve significantly on a staff-designed drama and dance evaluative instrument.

Subjects:

40 participants enrolled in the program.

Methods and Procedures:

A pre-post administration of a staff-designed drama and dance evaluative instrument.

Analysis of Data:

The pre-post test scores of the 40 participants will be compared. Differences in mean performance will be computed. Participants demonstrating significant improvement will be identified and tallied.

Evaluation Objective 5: To determine the extent to which the program as actually carried out was consistent with the program as described in the project proposal and any subsequent modifications.

Subjects:

All participants in the program.

Methods and Procedures:

In order to evaluate the quality and the extent to which the program had been implemented, careful monitoring of the program will be carried out by conducting site visits at the beginning and at the end of the project. By examining rosters containing lists of personnel working in the project, along with other documents related to the implementation of the program. By maintaining continuous contact with the project coordinator and the project director, in order to obtain information on all aspects of the functioning of the program. Teachers and consultants working in the program will also be interviewed.

Analysis of Data:

A statement concerning the extent of the implementation of the program will be made. Where serious discrepancies exist between the program as described in the project proposal and the program as implemented, a description of those discrepancies will be provided.

Chapter III: Findings

Evaluation Objective 1: To determine whether as a result of participation in the reading component of the program pupil participants attending 60% or more of the scheduled sessions will achieve a 65% mastery of a 400-word vocabulary list.

A total of 103 participants who attended 60% or more of the scheduled sessions scored 65% or better on the vocaulary test. The objective was therefore judged to have been achieved. The objective suggested a 400-word vocabulary list. However, due to late funding and a shortened time period for the implementation of the program, a staff-designed 100-word vocabulary test was substituted.

Evaulation Objective 2: To determine whether as a result of participation in the reading component of the program, pupil participants attending 60% or more of the sessions will demonstrate a month's gain in reading comprehension for each month in the program as measured by the pre-post administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Test Advanced, Forms G and H.

The pre and post-test scores for the participants were compared. Differences in mean performance were computed to ascertain whether pupils had attained one month's increment in reading comprehension. Seventy nine pupils in the project demonstrated this increment. Evaluation objective 2 could not be judged to have been attained.

Evaluation Objective 3: To determine whether as a result of participation in the program, participants attending 60% or more of the scheduled sessions in the mathematics component of the

program, after the first two months, as measured by the pre-post administration of the Intermediate Form H of the Metropolitan Achievement Test in Mathematics.

The pre and post-test scores for the participants were compared. Differences in mean performance were computed to ascertain whether pupils had attained one month's increment in Mathematics. Those pupils demonstrating this gain were tallied. One hundred and twenty pupils in the project demonstrated this gain. Therefore Evaluation Objective 3 could be judged to have been attained.

Evaluation Objective 4: To determine whether as a result of participation in the program pupil participants in 60% or more of the scheduled sessions of the drama and the dance components of the program will improve significantly on a staff designed drama and dance evaluative instrument.

The performance of many pupils in the drama and the dance component did significantly improve. This fact was attested to by the drama and the dance consultants. Although there were 40 participants enrolled in these components, pre-post test data were available for only 14 participants in drama and 16 in dance. Therefore no conclusions could be reached. The drama and dance components were developed for a program lasting an academic year. The subjective rating scale developed by the consultants could not be applied at this time.

Evaluation Objective 5: To determine the extent to which the program as actually carried out was consistent with the program as described in the project proposal and any subsequent modifications.

An examination of project personnel rosters and other documents supplied by the Project Coordinator and the Project Director indicated that 16 individuals were employed by the project during its implementation - March 3, 1976 through June 8, 1976. These individuals provided direct or indirect services to the project during the period of implementation. They all worked for 4 hours per week at the selected sites.

The program was conducted simultaneously at each of the sites - IS 258K, IS 117K, JHS 265K and JHS 294K on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons between the hours of 3;00 p.m. and 5;00 p.m. from March 3, 1976 through June 8, 1976. The average attendance was approximately 200 participants compared with 400 as indicated in the project proposal. Steps are being implemented to bolster the sagging attendance. The components of the program included Reading, Mathematics, and Career Education.

Regularly licensed New York City Board of Education personnel were employed to staff the Reading, Mathematics and Career Education components. The Drama and the Dance components were staffed by a Professional Drama Instructor (Consultant) and a Professional Dance Instructor (Consultant).

Evaluation of the instructional program consisted of observing the facilities and the materials, and monitoring and evaluating the instructional activities. Interviews were also held with staff members in the various curricular components. The classroom space utilized by the program was adequate. No problems were observed with the physical plant.

Observations of the instructional sessions revealed that

the attendance was at best erratic. Although the proposal indicated that a total population of about 400 pupils would participate, the average number served was about 200 participants. A large number of participants who was present for the pre-test was absent for the post-test and vice versa. Interviews with the coordinator and project director suggested that the activities of this project under review were in heavy competition with other Spring, extra curricular activities in the school district, for example, Bicentennial activities. This fact, coupled with the realities of implementing a program that is new and innovative did influence the attendance record. In addition, the recruitment, selection and appointment of teaching personnel to staff classrooms other than in their home school, dealt a further blow to the sagging attendance. Experience suggested that the centers staffed by teachers from that center had better attendance records and a more stable program.

The quality of the instructional activities varied from center to center and from classroom to classroom. However, teacher-pupil rapport appeared quite high throughout the centers. Some of the instructional materials mentioned in the project proposal were not observed in use by this evaluator during the site visits. The trip program which was designed to compliment the Career Education component also had its share of difficulties. This component is in need of rethinking and reconceptualization. The major problem was that most sites judged to be adequate for career planning were closed on Saturdays, the day selected for major trips. With better pre-planning and more scheduling of

sites, such as college campuses, this compenent could be greatly improved.

Interviews with teachers, in addition to those with the project coordinator and the project director suggested that the project could have benefited from more orientation and pre-planning. Although the teachers utilized instructional materials and other resources from their regular classrooms, the late arrival of some teachers who were given assignments at schools other than their home schools, did have an effect on the program. The role of Guidance and the function of the Guidance Counselor was not clear throughout the implementation of the program. This component is also seriously in need of rethinking and reconceptualization.

The dance component and the drama component were staffed by consultants, professionals from the field of Performing Arts. This concept is an excellent one. However, many of the dance sessions were carried on by substitute consultants, since, the regular consultant was unavailable because of prior commitments. It appears that regularly licensed New York City Board of Education personnel (drama and dance) could perform just as efficiently. This is especially true in the areas of documentation, record keeping and the recognition factor which would help bolster and stabilize attendance.

The activities demonstrate that the staff is actively committed to the accomplishment of programmatic goals and objectives. However, Evaluation Objective 5 could be judged to have been only partially attained.

Chapter IV: Summary of Major Findings Conclusions and Recommendations

The High School Preparation Program had as its major overall objective, an increase in the number of pupils from Community School District 13 eligible to attend special high schools in New York City. There were approximately 200 voluntary participants in the project. The program was offered on Tuesdays and on Thursdays between the hours of 3:00 P.M. and 5:00 P.M. at four different sites - I.S. 117K, I.S. 258K, J.H.S. 265K and J.H.S. 294K. The program was implemented as much as possible considering the rather erratic attendance record, late funding and the late implementation date, when viewed against the program as described in the project proposal.

Evaluation Objective 1: To determine whether as a result of participation in the reading component of the program pupil participants attending 60% or more of the scheduled sessions will achieve a 65% mastery of a 400 word vocabulary list (modified). This objective could be judged to have been attained.

Evaluation Objective 2: To determine whether as a result of participation in the reading component of the program, pupil participants attending 60% or more of the scheduled sessions will demonstrate a month's gain in reading comprehension as measured by the pre-post administration of the MAT's advanced Form G & H. This objective could not be judged to have been attained.

Evaluation Objective 3: To determine whether as a result of participation in the program, participants attending 60% or more of the scheduled sessions of the Mathematics component of

the program will demonstrate a month's gain in Mathematics for each month in the program after the first two months as measured by a pre-post administration of Intermediate Form H of the MAT's in Mathematics. This objective could be judged to have been attained.

Evaluation Objective 4: To determine whether as a result of participation in the program, pupil participants in 60% or more of the scheduled sessions of the drama and dance components of the program, will improve significantly on a staff-designed drama and dance evaluative instrument. This objective could not be evaluated because of insufficiency of data.

Evaluation Objective 5: To determine the extent to which the program as actually carried out was consistent with the program as described in the project proposal and any subsequent modifications. This objective could be judged to be only partially attained because of the late arrival of instructional materials and competing extra curricular activities in Community School District 13.

This evaluator concludes that inasmuch as Evaluation Objectives 1 and 3 have been attained, Objective 2 has not been attained and Objective 4 and 5 only partially attained, that, the program has certainly been worthwhile and strongly recommends that it be continued.

The following recommendations based primarily on site visits and a review of project documents are made to strengthen the program and educationally justify its continued existence.

1. That a secretary be appointed to the project for six hours per week to assist with record keeping, documentation, preparation of payroll, preparation of instructional

materials and other clerical chores, budget permitting

2. That the Project Director be assigned 8 hours per week for the project and in addition assume the responsibilities of the Project Coordinator, budget permitting.
3. That the program commence by October 1, 1976 to allow for the following:
   a. An early implementation date.
   b. Early procurement of instructional materials and supplies.
   c. Better articulation with the date scheduled for the examinations for special high schools in New York City.
   d. Better articulation with the day school program.
   e. More efficient communication among staff members.
4. That the administration of the day school program should be much more involved in the promotion and implementation of the program.
5. That staff selected for the program should be members of the day program at the particular site. The recognition factor will help bolster and stabilize attendance.
6. That regularly licensed New York City Board of Education Drama and Dance teachers replace the Drama and Dance Instructors (Consultants). This will facilitate recruiting, screening and selecting prospective students, help stabilize attendance and enhance record keeping and documentation for the project.
7. That the role of Guidance and the function of the Guidance Counselor be restructured. This will facilitate the

crucial component, Career Education, and the pre-planning and scheduling of trips upon which the success of this component is so dependent.

8. That sets of Behavioral Objectives be prepared for each curricular area and be disseminated to the various sites. This will help promote program uniformity.

9. That the orientation and planning period be extended so that staff will become more conversant with project objectives, directions and the subject matter content of the program.

APPENDIX A.

HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATION PROGRAM

COORDINATOR'S/DIRECTOR'S OVERALL REPORT

Schools_____,_____,_____,_____,_____ Director_____

1. How do you feel about continuation of the current program? (check one)

___a. Continue as now organized

___b. Continue, but modify organization

___c. Discontinue

If you responded a or c, why?_____

If you responded b, describe modification you would recommend.

2. How do you feel about continuation of the current grades in the program (check one)

_____a. Continue as now organized

_____b. Continue, but modify organization

_____c. Discontinue

If you responded a or c, why?_____

If you responded b, describe modification you would recommend.

3. Which school had the best overall program? P.S._____

4. What three factors do you think contributed most to the success of that program?

_____

_____

_____

5. Which school had the best Grade program? P.S._____

6. What three factros do you think contributed most to the success of that program?

_____

_____

_____

7. When a program was not going well, what three factors (other than the competency of the teachers) usually contributed most to its lack of success?

_____

_____

_____

8. What was the range of class registers?

Single Classes

	Lowest Single Class Register		Highest Single Class Register
	P.S._____ #_____,		P.S._____
Grade #_____,	P.S._____ #_____,		P.S._____
Grade #_____,	P.S._____ #_____,		P.S._____

Paired Classes

	Lowest		Highest
	P.S._____ #_____,		P.S._____
Grade #_____,	P.S._____ #_____,		P.S._____
Grade #_____,	P.S._____ #_____,		P.S._____

9. Additional Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Strengths of Program: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. Weaknesses of Program: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. Recommendations: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B.

HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATION PROGRAM

TEACHER INTERVIEW GUIDE

School _____ Borough _____ Date _____

Teacher _____ Interviewer _____
(optional)

Class Register _____

Grade _____ No. of Assistants _____

1. What do you consider to be the specific strengths of this project?

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. What do you consider to be the specific weaknesses of this project?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Do you feel that project components have been helpful in promoting pupil learning in your class? (check one)

_____ Extremely helpful

_____ Quite helpful

_____ Helpful

_____ Very little help

_____ No help at all

Comments _____

_____

_____

_____

4. Describe type of additional material received.

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. How would you rate the quality of these materials? (check one)

_____Excellent _____Fair

_____Good _____Poor

_____Average _____Don't know

6. How would you rate the academic learning increment evidenced by your pupils? (check one)

_____Excellent _____Fair

_____Good _____Poor

_____Average _____Don't know

7. How do you feel about the continuation of the current project? (check one)

_____Continue as now organized

_____Continue, but modify organization

_____Discontinue

_____Undecided

8. Additional Comments

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____